

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed September 12, 2005. In view of the following remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-8 is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Office Action, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,909,117 to Ohnuma (hereinafter "Ohnuma"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP § 2131 (*quoting Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." *Id.* (*quoting Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). In addition, "the reference must be enabling and describe the applicant's claimed invention sufficiently to have placed it in possession of a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention." *In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1479, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Independent claim 1 recites "said second gate region being disposed over said second channel region and overlapping with neither of said first and said second LDD regions." Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and thus, also include this claim language.

In rejecting claims 1-8, the Examiner asserted that Ohnuma discloses "an active matrix ... comprising ... said second gate region being disposed over said second channel region and overlapping with neither of said first and said second LDD regions." However, upon closer reading of Ohnuma, Ohnuma does not disclose said second gate region being disposed over said second channel region and overlapping with neither of said first and said second LDD regions. Furthermore, the Examiner did not cite or refer to any specific teachings in Ohnuma to support the Examiner's assertion.

Instead, Ohnuma is directed to "a method of forming a GOLD structure polycrystalline silicon TFT having both Lov regions and Loff regions." Ohnuma, col. 11, lines 57-58; *see also* col. 14, lines 9-11 and lines 16-17; col. 15, lines 34-35; col. 22, lines 61-63 and lines; col. 24, lines 60-62 and lines 65-67; abstract. The Lov region is the part of the LDD region that is overlapped by the "first layer gate electrodes 453-456." Ohnuma, col. 18, lines 60-66. Further, Ohnuma expressly states that "the pixel region and the peripheral circuit as the driver circuit comprise a GOLD [(Gate-Overlapped LDD)] structure polycrystalline silicon TFT having both the Lov regions and the Loff regions." Ohnuma, col. 10, lines 39-43. Thus, Ohnuma does not disclose an active matrix comprising said second gate region being disposed over said second channel region and overlapping with neither of said first and said second LDD regions.

Consequently, Ohnuma does not disclose each and every element of claims 1-8. Therefore, Ohnuma does not anticipate claims 1-8. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the pending claims.

If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Evan R. Witt

Reg. No. 32,512

Attorney for Applicants

Date: December 2, 2005

MADSON & METCALF
Gateway Tower West
15 West South Temple, Suite 900
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
Telephone: 801/537-1700